

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,800	11/06/2000	Thomas Strungmann	4271-29PUS	5697

7590

05/09/2002

Thomas C Pontani
Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane
Suite 1210
551 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER

TRAN, SUSAN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/674,800

Applicant(s)
Strungmann

Examiner
Susan Tran

Art Unit
1615



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 10, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's Preliminary Amendment A filed 11/05/01, Information Disclosure Statement filed 07/30/01, Request for Extension of Time filed 04/10/02, and Preliminary Amendment B filed 04/10/02.

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 04/10/02 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 8 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 16, 26, and 28 are rejected in the use of the phrase "content a first active ingredient", which is recite the broad recitation, but the claim also recites "said first active ingredient comprising at least one of candesartan and one of its pharmaceutically suitable esters

Art Unit: 1615

or salts” which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). It is unclear whether the system comprising candesartan and its pharmaceutically esters or salts in an alternative manor, or as a mixture of both. Further clarification is requested.

Regarding claim 27, the phrase "rubber-like" renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "rubber-like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim 31 is indefinite in the use of the phrase “elected from the group consisting of”. If Markush language is intended, the appropriate phrasing is “selected from the group consisting of”. Correction is suggested.

Art Unit: 1615

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 16, 17, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Frangin et al. US 5,985,915.

Frangin teaches a patch for transdermal composition comprising active ingredients, excipient (column 6, lines 24-65), and at least one additional cardioactive agent selected from the group consisting of diuretic, and angiotensin II, e.g., candesartan (column 8, lines 43-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frangin et al.

Art Unit: 1615

Frangin is relied upon for the reasons stated above. In the case that applicant's attorney can overcome the above 102(e) rejection, the examiner relies on the 103(a) rejection. Regarding to claims 18-22, the reference differs from the claimed invention by not teaching the specific form of candesartan or its' salts. However, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of the ordinary skill in this art to, by routine experimentation determine a suitable form of candesartan suitable for transdermal patch.

The examiner notes that Frangin is silent as to the teaching of diuretic or calcium blocker as a second therapeutic agent. However, Frangin teaches the active ingredients selected from benzofuran can be formulated in combination with one or more pharmaceutically vehicles (see abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in this art to select more than one cardioactive agent, e.g. diuretic and angiotensin inhibitor, to obtain a transdermal patch containing candesartan.

5. Claims 16, 17, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poss US 5,616,591, in view of Frangin et al.

Poss teaches a composition for transdermal patch comprising an angiotensin inhibitor agent in combination with a diuretic agent as a second compound (columns 7, lines 40 through column 8, lines 1-29). Poss does not suggest the use of a specific compound of angiotensin inhibitor.

Art Unit: 1615

Frangin teaches a transdermal patch composition comprising angiotensin inhibitor agent, e.g., candesartan (column 8, lines 66-67). Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Poss's transdermal patch using candesartan as an angiotensin agent in view of the teaching of Frangin. The reasons for this modification is to obtain a transdermal patch containing candesartan useful for the treatment of heart diseases.

6. Claims 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poss and Frangin et al., in view of Jalonen et al. US 5,464,628.

Poss and Frangin are relied upon for the reasons stated above. The references are silent as to the teaching of the ingredients of a transdermal patch.

Jalonen teaches a pharmaceutical composition containing substituted imidazoles to be administered transdermally (abstract). The transdermal patch comprises a an impermeable backing layer and an adhesive layer; or an impermeable backing layer, an adhesive layer, and a matrix layer; or a drug reservoir system (column 2, lines 36-64). The backing layer can be flexible or non-flexible materials: polyethylene, or polypropylene; the adhesive layer can be polysiloxanes, polyacrylates, or ethylene-vinyl acetate; and the matrix layer can be of natural or synthetic rubbers (column 3, lines 21-51). The composition further comprising carrier and penetration enhancers, e.g., polyethylene glycol, propylene glycol, isopropanol, ethanol, oil, or a mixture thereof (column 2, lines 65 through column 3, lines 1-20). Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of the ordinary skill in this art to prepare Poss's and Frangin's

Art Unit: 1615

composition in a transdermal patch in view of the teaching of Jalonon. The reasons for this modification is to obtain a candesartan transdermal patch that will provide a high bioavailability of drug penetration.

Pertinent Arts

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chen et al. is cited as being of interest for the teaching of candesartan in transdermal form.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Tran whose telephone number is (703) 306-5816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page, can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3592.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600